

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE CITY COUNCIL
UNDER PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

YOU MAY ADDRESS THE CITY COUNCIL ON ANY ITEM **NOT LISTED** ON THE AGENDA UNDER **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS** BY COMPLETING THIS FORM AND PRESENTING IT TO THE CITY CLERK. YOU ARE ALLOWED THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL. UNLESS YOUR PETITION IS DEEMED BY THE COUNCIL TO BE AN EMERGENCY (SEE THE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA FOR THE DEFINITION OF EMERGENCY), THE COUNCIL CANNOT TAKE ACTION OR HAVE EXTENDED DISCUSSION ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA. (California Government Code Sections 54954.2, 54954.3 and 54956.5)

TO HAVE AN ITEM PLACED ON THE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA, PLEASE SUBMIT A **WRITTEN PETITION** TO THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE. WRITTEN PETITIONS ARE GENERALLY CONSIDERED BY THE CITY COUNCIL TWO WEEKS AFTER SUBMITTAL.

TO: CITY COUNCIL - City of Santa Clara

FROM: Name: ERLINDA ESTRADA

Address: 3119 EL SOBRANTE ST

City: SANTA CLARA **Telephone:*** 408 230 0675 (cell)

SUBJECT MATTER: (Briefly state the contents of the matter to be presented to the Council.)

RECENT ARTICLE IN SF CHRONICLE (6-3-07 p B3)
RE: 49ers training fields

Signed: Erlinda Estrada

Date: 6/5/07

***NOTE:** This is a public document. If your telephone number is unlisted or if you do not want it to be public, please provide an alternate number where you can be reached.

06/05/07
To: City Council, City of Santa Clara, 1500 Warburton Ave, S.C. 95050

To Whom It May Concern;

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2007

City Clerk's Office
City of Santa Clara

We, the residents of the City of Santa Clara are against any utility raises and /or any other cost that the City's money could be spent on toward the 49er's stadium, parking garage, and /or moving the electrical sub-station.

We feel that the City of Santa Clara is not a large city with a large tax base, but rather a suburb of working people and retirees. The cost of living, property taxes and food goes up every year, thus leaving the residents with less capital.

The City's fathers plan on incurring the cost for the stadium, spending the City's money in these uncertain times, by using our safety net, i.e. the reserves. We feel this is not a safe move, especially since other municipalities have had financial problems with such efforts. As an option there could be a tax on the professional ball players each time they use the field.

Once again, the residents of the City of Santa Clara are against any financial cost to the residents, or using City money -- other than possible bonds -- for the construction of the stadium and associated structures.

NAME

ADDRESS

1. Marge Baker - 3260-Homestead Rd. #2 - Santa Clara
2. Greg Baker - 3240-Homestead Rd., S.Cl.
3. Marge/Greg Baker - 3110-Homestead Rd., S.Cl.
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____

Mail to; City Council, City of Santa Clara, 1500 Warburton Ave.,
Santa Clara, CA95050

Remarks addressed to City Council, June 5, 2007

Mary Emerson, Santa Clara

<http://www.stadiumfacts.org>

Thank you for investing in this analysis performed by KMA. It is great to see such a cooperative effort among KMA, City Staff, CS&L as well as the 49ers to develop this report.

A number of items jumped out at me as worthy of additional analysis.

1. Alternate uses of the land could be much more economically productive and/or viable.

It is important to not consider the 49ers stadium proposal in a vacuum. As KMA correctly points out, there are many potential uses of a 15 acre parcel of prime real estate.

The Class A office example was very illustrative, providing approximately 4.7 times the economic benefit of a stadium, while likely requiring no city investment beyond addressing the parking structure. Definitely a winner from an economic perspective.

However, I realize that the city has other goals.

The City Council Adopted Goals for 2005 to 2007 at:

http://www.ci.santa-clara.ca.us/city_gov/city_gov_council_adopted_goals.html

explicitly state the goal of

Encourag[ing] enhancement of 'Entertainment Theme' In Convention Center/Theme Park Area ... [by] ... Study[ing] methods to enhance [the] entertainment theme.

If the City Council really wants to push forward with an entertainment district, they should put the effort into developing a vision, and then issue a request for proposals with well-articulated goals & key decision-making criteria.

I would expect there to be a specific budget allocated to enhancing the district, as well as goals such as:

- diversity of venues, increasing chances of success of the district by not putting all our eggs in one basket;
- appeal to a large cross-section of the Santa Clara community;
- pedestrian-level access to all venues in the district, to encourage "cross-pollination" among the venues; and,
- pedestrian-friendly access from nearby sites such as the Convention Center, Theme Park, Mercado and light rail.

Remarks to City Council, June 5, 2007

Mary Emerson, Santa Clara

<http://www.stadiumfacts.org>

I would like to see Council do their due diligence in developing a vision and budget for developing the entertainment district, soliciting and evaluating alternative proposals, and ensuring that any investment in that development meets clearly articulated goals and criteria.

2. New employment created as a by-product of the Stadium project would generally be low paying rather than professional jobs.

The chart at the bottom of page 8 of the KMA report separates existing benefits from the training facility & headquarters from the new benefits of a stadium. The jobs introduced by the stadium come to 515 full time equivalents, or \$17M in 2007 dollars. This means that the new jobs would be, on average, \$33K/year salaries. This is well below the city average, and certainly not where we want to focus employment growth.

2000 census data indicates that average per capita income in 1999 was \$31,755; median earnings were \$58,641 for male year-round full-time workers and \$43,131 for female year-round full-time workers. This data is from:

<http://www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/cities/SantaClara.pdf>

Allowing for inflation, the average far exceeds \$33,000 in 2007 dollars.

3. We really appreciate KMA's diligence in working with CS&L to develop a clearer model for comparison.

Specifically, the economic impact report was clarified dramatically by:

- separating the incremental benefits attributed to a new stadium vs. the benefits already provided by the 49ers Training Facility & Headquarters;
- restating benefits in 2007 dollars;
- correcting the erroneous assumption of \$125K in sales tax revenue from parking & hotel, which are not subject to sales tax in CA; and,
- recognizing the fallacy of assuming that players spend 50% of their gross, which is clearly a stretch considering they're probably in the 40% tax bracket.

The city made a good investment in obtaining this outside analysis.

Finally, I have a comment on the 49ers responses to questions posed by City Council.

I was shocked and dismayed by the veiled threat in the 49ers response to question #1. I also question the validity of the statements. Since the average salary for HQ jobs is \$67K in 2007 dollars (according to the breakout on page 8 of KMA's report), these are primarily professional jobs. There will likely be a high retention of those employees regardless of where the stadium is located. This is especially true in a business that requires highly specialized skills and relationships. Players, coaches, HQ staff, etc., are highly unlikely to change jobs due to a move in the stadium.

Remarks to City Council, June 5, 2007
Mary Emerson, Santa Clara

<http://www.stadiumfacts.org>